



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,598	12/05/2003	Joe Stugan	23418.00	7507
37833	7590	11/18/2004	EXAMINER	
LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD. P.O. BOX 15035 CRYSTAL CITY STATION ARLINGTON, VA 22215			ALIMENTI, SUSAN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,598

Applicant(s)

STUGAN, JOE

Examiner

Susan C. Alimenti

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/5/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the fastening strips", and claims 10-12 recite "the fastening means" in line 2 of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheehy (US 2,516,264).

Sheehy discloses an animal abatement device, usable for repelling birds from a boat, comprising a generally circular element 1, a power supply, a positively and negatively charged wires 4 & 5 (Sheehy, col. 2, lns.30-36) embedded in the top side of element 1. The wires 4 & 5 are configured in the form of a swirl with said wires lying proximate one another and curling about the top surface of said circular element 1. It is further noted that top element 10 is readily removable, and the device would still work properly without said top element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sheehy.

Regarding claim 5, Sheehy discloses the claimed device, except one might argue that the wires 4 & 5 do not begin the swirl at the “center” of the circular element 1. The center or *central area* (emphasis added) of Sheehy’s device is considered broadly to be the area inwards of the outer perimeter of the element 1, however rearranging Sheehy’s device by beginning the swirl at a *central point* (emphasis added) of element 1 would not alter the scope of the invention. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to begin the swirl of the wire at the central point of the circular element enlarging the coverage area, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

6. Claims 2, 3, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheehy

Regarding claim 2, Sheehy discloses the claimed invention except it is not positively disclosed from what type of ceramic element 1 is made. Sheehy does, however, teach that a preferred material would be a “ceramic, or equivalent insulating material, preferably a material

Art Unit: 3644

which is somewhat wear resistant and readily cleansable” (Sheehy, col.2, lns.21-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct element 1 from a masonite ceramic peg board, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 3, Sheehy is non-specific as to the type of material wires 4 & 5 are made of. It is well known in the electrical arts that 14, 16, and 18 gauge cooper wire is a preferable conducting material for the purposes of Sheehy’s device. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use 14, 16 or 18 gauge cooper wire, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 9-12, as best understood, Sheehy does not positively disclose a method for securing his device to a stationary point. The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use some type of fastening means to maintain Sheehy’s repelling device in a stationary position since it is known in the art that in many situations this is a preferable option for the user.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheehy as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiroshi (JP 11-9171) and Pueyo et al. (US 5,986,551).

Sheehy discloses the claimed invention except he does not utilize a light system in addition to the electrocuting system in order to further deter animals from approaching the area of the device. It is well known that certain bright flashing lights will deter animals, such as

Art Unit: 3644

birds, from approaching an area containing such lights. Hiroshi discloses a device in the same field of invention, i.e. animal abatement devices, that utilizes flashing LED lights to deter birds from entering an area. The combination of multiple pest deterring devices has also been illustrated in the art, as disclosed by Pueyo et al. (Pueyo hereafter). Pueyo's bird deterrent device utilizes a multi-phase method that employs at least two (visual and audible) bird frightening devices on a site (Pueyo, Abstract). Pueyo teaches that this overlapping of deterrent devices increases the effectiveness of scaring the birds and keeping them from returning to a particular area (col.3, ln.43 to col.4, ln.6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was used to combine the electric shock of Sheehy's device with Hiroshi's light deterrent system, since it is well known in the art to combine multiple pest repelling methods in order to increase the overall effectiveness of the device.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 6-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan C. Alimenti whose telephone number is 703-306-0360. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9am-5pm.

Art Unit: 3644

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 703-305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SCA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Teri P. Luu', with a stylized, flowing script.

TERI P. LUU
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER